| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|------------------------|----------------|
| | 10/792,364 | SHAFFER ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Harry S. Hong | 2614 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | |
| (1) <u>Harry S. Hong</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Luke K. Pedersen (Reg. No. 45,003)</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 2 April 2007 | Time: <u>12:30 PM</u> | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: N/A | | |
| Claims discussed: 1, 9, 11, 12, 30, 37, 39, 50, 52, 53, and 57 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: N/A | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: In order to expedite prosecution, Mr. Pedersen agreed to amend above claims. Refer to the attached Examiner's Amendment. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| (Examiner/SPB Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | |